evil which calls for remedy. The Bill as drafted, while securing to the people the rights which they enjoy at present, enables Government to buy up such of the treasure as may be deemed necessary for their purpose. I beg to move that the principle of the Bill be affirmed and that it be taken up for consideration at once.

Seconded by Mr. Govinda Pillai.

Mr. Kuruvila.—Sir, Many of the suggestions I have to make about this Bill are such as would be properly and conveniently dealt with in the Select Committee stage; and I therefore do not propose to deal with them now. But in my humble opinion, there are one or two points which are so vitally connected with the principle of the Bill that I find it my duty to refer to them before the principle of the Bill is affirmed.

The provisions of the Penal Code for theft, misappropriation &c., are now available to the public for protection when their movable properties are interfered with by those who have no right to them, and the provisions of the Bill are evidently superfluous for the protection of property, the ownership of which is known or easily provable. In fact, the very meaning of the word "treasure-trove" presumes that ownership of the find is unknown. But the Bill unfortunately confuses treasures whose ownership is practically indisputable with treasure-troves exhumed as the result of laborious and expensive exploration by archæologists and thereby molests true owners with the necessity of civil suits and other harassing proceedings. To a modern economist, the burying of valuable coin or bullion is no doubt repugnant; but it is well acknowledged that, in the unsettled state of the country in bygone generations, local ideas of reserve funds and of auspicious functions at the starting of large buildings, sanctioned and encouraged the burying of treasures in cellars and under foundations in their buildings or at their dwelling sites. It would be against the respect due to the [illegible] of property not to exclude such common finds from the definition of "treasure" in the Treasure-Trove Bill. Indeed the statement of objects and reasons and the appearance of Sections 9, 10, 11, 15 &c., show that appropriation of such treasures is not the object of the proposed measure and that the preservation of archæological finds is the main incentive. Believing therefore that the Mover has no intention to interfere with the rights of owners and of descendants and heirs of those who had deposited their reserve funds at their dwelling places, I beg to submit that the scope of the Bill should be restricted so as to render it innocuous to true owners, by modifying the definition of the word "treasure" and making it apply only to any valuable article of archæological interest hidden more than twenty feet below the soil and unearthed by any person other than the rightful owner of the place in which the articles were deposited.

Mr. Udaya Varma Raja.—I perfectly agree with my friend Mr. Kuruvila in holding that there is no necessity for Government interference in cases of discovery of treasures by persons in their own lands. Instead of doing any good to such finders, the Bill will surely give them undesirable trouble. With this remark, Sir, I beg to affirm the principle of the Bill.

The Council having affirmed the principle of the Bill, Mr. Sankara Menon proposed that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mr. A Sri Narayanan Thampi, Mr. K. K. Kuruvila, Mr. S. Padmanabha Iyer and the Mover, to report before the next ordinary meeting.

The motion was put and agreed to.

THE FACTORIES BILL.

Mr. Sankara Menon.—I do not think that any argument is necessary for me to commend this Bill to you. Factories constitute one of the distinguishing features of the commercial and industrial activity of a country. The number of factories in the State has shown a steady increase and at the end of the last year there were 45

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

factories with 4,350 operatives including 1,361 children and 617 women. 11 of these factories were worked by steam power, an equal number by oil engines and the rest by water power, manual labour or electricity. Perils of various kinds are incidental to the working of factories and it is the duty of every civilised Government to ensure the safety and comfort of the labourers employed therein by making necessary provision for their proper and efficient supervision. To regulate the age limit of the operatives and the hours of their working and to insist on factory managers to provide necessary precautions regarding plants, machinery &c., used in their factories so as to prevent accidents calculated to endanger the personal safety of the workmen, are the generally recognised forms in which the State interferes in these matters. At present there is no law here to enforce any such restraint and Government have off and on found it difficult to secure compliance with their orders. The Bill before you has been drafted on the lines of the British Indian Act No. 15 of 1881. It might be urged that we could have waited with advantage till the report of the recent Factory Commission of British India, which is nearing completion, is published. But in view of the infant stage of factory life in this State, the Government have thought it unnecessary to wait as they are fully alive to the danger of any undue interference with the freedom of contract so essential to the development of trade and industry and as it is not intended to lay down more than a few general and elementary rules. With these observations I beg to move that the principle of the Bill be affirmed.

Mr. Udaya Varma Raja.—Sir, The member in charge of the Bill says that it has been drafted upon the lines of the British Indian Act No. 15 of 1881. Strictly speaking he ought to have said that it has been drafted on the lines of the British Indian Act No. 15 of 1881 as amended by Act No. 11 of 1891, for new sections and verbal alterations introduced by the Act of 1891 do also find a place in the Bill. But I am surprised to find that he has not adopted all the changes brought about by the amending Act. While the Bill has only some of the advantages of the amending Act, it still has some of the disadvantages of the original Act. It would have been a relief to us if the learned member had given in his statement of objects and reasons, his explanation for having so framed the Bill. But I congratulate my friend, the Mover of the Bill, on his having suggested two new and important provisions—the provision for water supply in factories and the provision for furnishing latrine accommodation and separate urinals. These are suggestions for which the operatives and all those interested in them can never be too thankful to him. The other provisions of the Bill are no doubt good though there may be difference of opinion regarding details which I do not think it necessary to refer to at this stage of the Bill. It is highly necessary that there should be a legal enactment to regulate labour in factories. I beg therefore to affirm the principle of the Bill.

The Council having affirmed the principle of the Bill, Mr. Sankara Menon proposed that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mr. A. Sri Narayanan Thampi, Mr. K. K. Kuruvila, Mr. S. Padmanabha Iyer and the Mover, to report before the next ordinary meeting.

The motion was put and agreed to.

CIVIL COURTS' BILL.

Mr. Ananda Row.—Mr. President and Gentlemen, The Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to Civil Courts in Travancore is now before you, together with the Select Committee's Report and Amendments. The Bill, as you know, consists of 20 Sections. Part I, consisting of two Sections, relates to the preliminary portion; Part II relates, to the establishment and constitution of Civil Courts subordinate to the High Court (Sections 3 to 7). The Bill declares that there shall be two classes of Civil Courts established

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly